

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

MARK SUPANICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEVIN RUNDLE, et ux, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C10-5008RBL

ORDER

THIS MATTER comes on before the above-entitled Court upon Plaintiff's Motions to Amend Complaint [Dkt. #24] and to Extend Time to Respond to Defendant's Motions [Dkt. #25]. Having considered the entirety of the records and file herein, the Court finds and rules as follows:

Plaintiff seeks again to amend his Complaint. The Court has once denied the motion ruling that the then proposed Amended Complaint named as defendants individuals and entities over which it appeared the Court lacked jurisdiction and otherwise failed to conform to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). [Dkt. #6]. Plaintiff was given 30 days to retrieve his proposed Amended Complaint (which with copies filled a bankers box) from the Clerk's Office or it would be destroyed. (*Id.*) Plaintiff's present motion to amend does not include a conforming proposed Amended Complaint nor does Plaintiff indicate in the motion what amendments Plaintiff intends. Because the Court has not been informed what claims and what defendants the proposed Amended Complaint contains, Plaintiff's Motion to Amend [Dkt. #24] is


DENIED.

1 Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time to Respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. #12] is
2 **GRANTED.** Plaintiff's response to the motion is due May 24, 2010 and the Defendants' Motion to
3 Dismiss is renoted for May 28, 2010.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 The Clerk shall send uncertified copies of this order to all counsel of record, and to any party
6 appearing pro se.

7 Dated this 26th day of April, 2010.

8
9 
10 RONALD B. LEIGHTON
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28